

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706

**REMARKS****Present Status of the Application**

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over York. After entering claim amendment, applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and states clearly how the application distinguishes from York. Applicant respectfully asserts that York does not anticipate any pending claims in the application, and reconsideration of claims 2, 6 and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

**Discussion of Office Action Rejections**

[35 USC 102 discussion]

The office Action rejected claims 2, 6 and 9-12 under 35 USC 102(b).

After entering the amendment in the claims, independent claims 2, 6 and 9 are patentable over York at least because York does not disclose the feature of "...the coprocessor number field determines one of a plurality of coprocessors to be activated." as claimed in claims 2 and 6, and the like feature as claimed in claim 9.

More specifically, the Office Action asserted that according to column 63 and column 64 in York, bits 8-11 can be viewed as a coprocessor number field, which stores information about a specific coprocessor to be activated (bits 8-11 store the number of the coprocessor i.e. in this case pic\_1). However, bits 8-11 of the instruction LDP store a value (pic\_1 or pic\_2 cited by the Office Action), which, according to column 61, lines 4-7 in York, is *an identifying number that*

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706

*identify that the coprocessor is a Piccolo coprocessor, and Piccolo has two identifying numbers that can be used depending upon the instruction concerned.* Therefore, it is clear that the value pic 1 or pic 2 is used depending on what kind of instruction is concerned but not which one of a plurality of coprocessors is used. Accordingly, York obviously does not disclose each and every element of claims 2, 6 and 9 of the present application, and therefore does not anticipate claims 2, 6 and 9 of the present application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 2, 6 and 9 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 10-12 patently define over the prior art as well.

Application No.: 09/752,123

Docket No.: JCLA6706


**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 2, 6 and 9-12 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 7/27/2004

4 Venture, Suite 250  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Tel.: (949) 660-0761  
Fax: (949) 660-0809

Respectfully submitted,  
J.C. PATENTS

  
Jiawei Huang  
Registration No. 43,330